DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 436 440 SO 030 657

AUTHOR Davis, Terri B.
TITLE Within These Many Lies the American One: Multiculturalism, Citizenship Training, and the Construction of an American "Paideia."
PUB DATE 1998-09-00
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (94th, Boston, MA, September 3-6, 1998).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; *Citizenship Responsibility; *Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Pluralism; Elementary Secondary Education; *Multicultural Education; *Nationalism

ABSTRACT

The idea of an American "paideia" (an ideal national public culture) is implicit in U.S. civic education and citizenship training. The role of schools in producing a particular type of character capable of sustaining the democratic regime has long been recognized and democratic principles have long guided civic education policy. This paper elaborates the arguments and meanings expressed through the literature on multiculturalism and argues that multiculturalism advocates a specific conception of an ideal national public culture. Two specific claims about multiculturalism are advanced. First, multiculturalism is a unique contemporary expression of a historical idea known as cultural pluralism. Second, the literature in multiculturalism contains both a unified vision of U.S. political culture and a variety of diverse theories concerning the specific political and philosophical principles to be used in constructing an ideal national political culture. The questions presented for citizenship training that derive from the debate about multiculturalism involve how a national public culture can be constructed from the diverse cultures in U.S. society and whether the U.S. "paideia" envisioned by multiculturalism is a desirable model for civic education. Includes 121 references. (LB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 436 440

"Within these Many Lies the American One Multiculturalism, Citizenship Training, and the Construction of an American *Paideia*"

by

Terri B. Davis

Lamar University
Department of Political Science
P. O. Box 10030
Beaumont, TX 77710
DavisTB@hal.lamar.edu

SO 030 657

Terri B. Davis

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Prepared for presentation at the 94th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 3 - 6, 1998, Boston, MA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The idea of an American *paideia* -- an ideal national public culture -- is implicit in American civic education and citizenship training. The role of schools in producing a particular type of character capable of sustaining the democratic regime has long been recognized[1] and democratic principles have long guided civic education policy.[2] The construction of an American *paideia* through civic education, however, involves much more than general beliefs in democratic principles; it involves ongoing and ever-present analyses of who we are, what we want, and what we aspire to be as a nation and as a people. Particular conceptions of the ideal national public culture for which citizens are to be produced are therefore prevalent in public discussions about American education policy and significantly inform the past, present, and future meanings of national political identity.

One conception of the American *paideia* that is advanced through discussions of education policy is contained in arguments for a core curriculum. Core curriculum arguments generally hold that a common cultural base consisting of a specific set of language, knowledge, customs, myths, values, and beliefs is essential to citizenship training. A common national culture and heritage is a given for advocates of the core curriculum, and a primary task of liberal education is to explore the specific texts and teachings of Western civilization that contain unifying truths about virtue and the good life.[3] A second conception of the American *paideia* is advanced through multiculturalism. Multiculturalism generally holds that an ideal national public culture has formed

---

[1]See LeSourd, Sandra J., "Integrating Pluralist Values for Reconstructing Society," Social Education, vol. 55, no. 1, (January 1991), pp. 52 - 54; Esquith, Stephen L., "Political Theory and Political Education," Political Theory, vol. 20, (1992), p. 248.

[2]The United States Supreme Court, for example, has at various times set forth the roles of education to include preparing children for adult citizenship, Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U. S. 205 (1972), awakening the child to cultural values, Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U. S. 483 (1954), and educating students to the responsibilities and values of democratic society, Ambach v. Norwick, 441 U. S. 68 (1978).

[3]See Bloom, Allan, Closing of the American Mind, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987); Hirsch, E. D., Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987); Kimball, Roger, Tenured Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education, (New York: Harper & Row, 1990); D'Souza, Dinesh, Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus, (New York: Free Press, 1991).

and continues to be formed by the interaction of diverse cultures in American society and argues that education policy should respect and reflect the cultural differences that comprise American social and political life. While critics of multiculturalism argue that it promotes separatism and division in American society and contains no real conception of a common national culture,[4] the literature of multiculturalism presents a view of the American *paideia* that stands in stark contrast to core curriculum and assimilationist models. As Peter Erickson writes:

> Rather than reject the ideal of a common culture, multiculturalism advocates a different, more complicated route by which to achieve it. . . . For the multiculturalist critic, a common culture is not a given; it has to be created anew by engaging the cultural differences that are part of American life.[5]

In this paper, I elaborate the arguments and meanings expressed through the literature on multiculturalism and argue that multiculturalism advocates a specific conception of an ideal national public culture. Two specific claims about multiculturalism are advanced. First, multiculturalism is a unique contemporary expression of an historical idea known as cultural pluralism. Evident in American political discourse since the nation's founding, cultural pluralism gained unique expression in the second half of the twentieth century through multiculturalism.[6]

---

[4]Well-known syndicated columnist and conservative news commentator George Will, for example, refers to multiculturalism as the "Balkanization of the life of the mind," and former President George Bush in an address at the University of Michigan appealed to students to "fight back against the boring politics of division and derision" expressed through multiculturalism. See Will, George F., "Commencement at Duke," The American Scholar, Autumn 1991, vol. 60, no. 4, reprinted in Cozic, Charles P., (ed.), Education in America: Opposing Viewpoints, (San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc., 1992), pp. 269 - 274. Bush, George, University of Michigan speech, May 4, 1991; quoted in Gless, Darryl and Barbara Herrnstein Smith (eds.), The Politics of Liberal Education, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1992), p. 15.

[5]Erickson, Peter, "Rather Than Reject a Common Culture, Multiculturalism Advocates a More Complicated Route by Which to Achieve It," Chronicle of Higher Education, June 26, 1991, vol. 37, no. 41, p. B2.

[6]In this chapter, I limit analysis of multiculturalism to its contemporary expression in United States academic and political discussion and specifically focus on multiculturalism as it is expressed in debates over education policy. The debate about multiculturalism, however, is neither new in political theory nor unique to the United States. As Michael Peters writes, the debate

Multiculturalism as a unique expression of cultural pluralism was produced as a result of the effects of the Civil Rights Movement and poststructuralist thought on American cultural pluralist theory.[7] Second, the literature in multiculturalism contains both a unified vision of American political culture and a variety of diverse theories concerning the specific political and philosophical principles to be used in constructing an ideal national political culture. In both its united and varied aspects, multiculturalism represents a body of understandings that seeks to reconstruct a national public ideal based on the attachments individuals hold to their cultural communities. The questions presented for citizenship training that derive from the debate about multiculturalism involve how a national public culture can be constructed from the diverse cultures in American society and whether the American *paideia* envisioned by multiculturalism is a desirable model for civic education.

I. The Historical Foundations of Cultural Pluralism and the Effects of the Civil Rights Movement and Poststructuralist Thought on American Cultural Pluralist Theory

---

> was intermingled from the start with the political, social and economic conditions that led to the development of the modern nation-state, with the history of European racism, white supremacism and colonization. [Its] prehistory is tied up with the perceptions of the first European explorers and missionaries who 'discovered' the New World and the worldview and cultural heritage of the European settlers who followed. The early history of ensuing debate is recorded in eighteenth-century European parliamentary and public debates over first contact with indigenous peoples, the civilizing mission of the West, problems of land purchase and the appropriate means of colonial government.

Peters, Michael, Poststructuralism, Politics and Education, (Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey, 1996), p. 175.

[7]Michael Geyer argues that the Civil Rights Movement and French poststructuralism "moulded the basic issues of a contemporary politics of representation that is at the core of the debate on multiculturalism." Geyer, Michael, "Multiculturalism and the Politics of General Education," Critical Inquiry, Spring 1993, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 499 - 533. My argument extends Geyer's statement by considering the Civil Rights Movement and French poststructuralism to have effected a politicization of cultural pluralism. In my argument, multiculturalism is considered to be a contemporary and politicized expression of cultural pluralism.

a. Cultural Pluralism in American History

The debate about multiculturalism, present in American academic discussion for about a decade, has received considerable attention outside the academy particularly at times when multiculturalist reform initiatives have been placed on the public policy agenda. Despite heated debate over textbook selection and curriculum revision,[8] faculty hirings and promotions,[9] and language instruction,[10] and despite the amount of publicity multiculturalism has been afforded in public debate, it is difficult to find in either academic literature or public policy discussion a concise, generally recognized definition of the term "multiculturalism." Lack of definition largely stems from the fact that many multiculturalists embrace the principles of cultural pluralism and refrain from speaking in one voice on issues of specific cultural meaning and understanding.[11] Rather than advocate a specific set of cultural understandings, multiculturalists advance the general normative idea that public policy in the United States should reflect and respect the cultural diversity and pluralism of American social and political life. A definition more expansive or concise runs the risk of subjecting a particular culture's history, conventions, practices, and beliefs to one transcultural standard or hierarchy, a subjection most multiculturalists believe

---

[8]For an excellent discussion of textbook selection and curriculum revision in the debate about multiculturalism, see Massaro, Toni Marie, Constitutional Literacy: A Core Curriculum for a Multicultural Nation, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), particularly Chapters Three and Four.

[9]See, for example, Kennedy, Duncan, "A Cultural Pluralist Case for Affirmative Action in Legal Academia," Duke Law Journal, September 1990, vol. 1990, no. 4, pp. 705 - 757, Matsuda, Mari, "Affirmative Action and Legal Knowledge: Planting Seeds in Plowed-Up Ground," Harvard Women's Law Journal, Spring 1988, vol. 11, pp. 1 - 17.

[10]For an excellent discussion of the debate over language instruction, see Crawford, James, (ed.), Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), particularly Part V., "Language Diversity and Education."

[11]Massaro, Toni Marie, 1993, p. 48.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

violates the cultural pluralist principle of respect for cultural autonomy.[12]

Cultural pluralism contains both a description of American society and a normative ideal for national life. As a descriptive theory, cultural pluralism is a condition in which two or more sharply contrasting cultural communities exist within the same political community.[13] The existence of many cultures in American society was commented on as early as 1782 when French emigrant Hector St. John Crevecoeur noted in Letters from an American Farmer that the nation was a mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans, and Swedes.[14] In the first recorded reference to America as a "melting pot," Crevecoeur focuses not on the cultural diversity of the new nation but on its cultural similarity when he writes that "individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men."[15] The description of America as a melting pot appears more an ideal for early American life than an accurate description. Both George Washington and John Quincy Adams voiced concern with cultural pluralism and diversity and sought to ensure that new emigrants would, in Washington's words, be "assimilated to our customs, measures and laws: in a word, soon become one people."[16] Like Crevecoeur's melting pot, the assimilation objectives of Washington and Adams met limited success, and the existence of many diverse cultures in the United States continued to be recognized and commented on by literary figures, political observers, and politicians throughout the nineteenth and twentieth

---

[12]Ibid, p. 48.

[13]Chaplin, Jonathan, "How Much Cultural and Religious Pluralism can Liberalism Tolerate?," in Horton, John, (ed.), Liberalism, Multiculturalism and Toleration, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), p. 32.

[14]Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., The Disuniting of America, (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1992), p. 24.

[15]Crevecoeur, Hector St. John, quoted in Schlesinger, ibid.

[16]Washington, George, quoted in Schlesinger, 1992, p. 25. As Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams instructed a potential German emigrant, Baron von Furstenwaerther, that emigrants to the United States "must cast off the European skin, never to resume it." Adams, John Quincy, in a letter written to Baron von Furstenwaerther, quoted in Schlesinger, 1992, p. 25.

centuries.[17]

As a normative political theory, cultural pluralism goes beyond description to assert that cultural diversity is a primary resource of American life. One of the first cultural pluralist arguments in American political discourse appeared in 1915 when the Jewish American philosopher Horace Kallen asserted in an essay entitled "Democracy Versus the Melting Pot"[18] that the United States was a federation of diverse nationalities and that it was neither possible nor advantageous for these cultures to abandon their identity. Influenced by the philosopher John Dewey, Kallen was convinced that the pluralistic needs of man are so deeply rooted in his nature that they cannot be eliminated,[19] and upon this theory he insisted that institutional attempts to assimilate and "melt" ethnicities into an American mold were violative of the basic demands of humankind.[20] Significantly, the publication of Kallen's first essay on cultural pluralism coincided with the sinking of the *Lusitania* by a German submarine, and at the expense of ongoing dialogue

---

[17]Schlesinger provides an excellent account of cultural diversity in literary and political works during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Among the specific examples cited are Alexis de Tocqueville's Democracy in America, Herman Melville's White Jacket and Redburn, James Bryce's The American Commonwealth, Frederick Jackson Turner's The Frontier in American History; Henry James's The American Scene, and entries from the journal of Ralph Waldo Emerson. See Schlesinger, 1992, particularly Chapter One.

[18]Kallen, Horace M., "Diversity Versus the Melting Pot," Nation, May 1915, vol. 100, pp. 219 - 220.

[19]I. B. Berkson, a contemporary of Kallen, was also deeply influenced by the philosophy of Dewey and made limited contributions to early twentieth century cultural pluralist theory. Berkson, like Kallen, argued that democracy implied the right of immigrants to retain the ethnic and cultural affiliation of their choice and therefore not to suffer any debilitating consequences from the exercise of this right. His greatest concern, however, was with neutralizing the forces in the larger society that prevented or impeded the choice of communities to dissolve or perpetuate themselves. According to Itzkoff, this central focus of Berkson's philosophy ties community to the larger society and views communities as voluntary possibilities rather than necessary adjuncts of the nation. Kallen, on the other hand, viewed communities as natural and cultural differentiation as requisite to the larger nation. See Itzkoff, Seymour W., Cultural Pluralism and American Education, (Scranton, PA: International Textbook Co., 1970) particularly Chapter Two, "Dewey and Cultural Pluralism," pp. 34 - 66.

[20]Itzkoff, 1970, p. 58.

about Kallen's theory, American political discussion quickly turned to issues of nationalization, Americanization, and assimilation.[21]

The Americanization movement that began in 1915 intensified throughout the 1920s into a xenophobic nationalism marked by what Massaro calls "panicky, defensive, and coercive" efforts to force the assimilation of cultural difference into "an 'American'-talking, 'American'-acting, flag saluting, industrious, responsible, clean and civic-minded, democratic man."[22] Against the assimilationist tide, radical American thinker Randolph Bourne inveighed against the melting-pot ideology and directed his criticisms against the American ruling class, a class "descendent of those British stocks which were the first permanent immigrants" and who dictated the terms of Americanization without the consent of the governed.[23] Americanization, Bourne argued, meant both physical exploitation of immigrants and the destruction of their national cultures. Instead of a "detritus of cultures," Bourne wished to see "a peaceful competition of various cultures which would result in a cosmopolitan 'federation of cultures,' turning America into the first 'international nation.'"[24]

In addition to Bourne's work in cultural pluralist theory during the Americanization era, Kallen

---

[21]Cultural pluralist reform proposals made prior to the publication of "Democracy Versus the Melting Pot" virtually disappeared from American political discourse after its publication. An example of cultural pluralist reform proposals made prior to the publication of Kallen's essay is the demand of German organizations during the mid- to late-1800s that German language classes be included in the public schools for German American students. This led to the temporary formation in San Francisco of "cosmopolitan" schools which provided bilingual and bicultural education. See Katznelson, Ira, and Margaret Weir, Schooling for All: Class, Race, and the Decline of the Democratic Ideal (New York: Basic Books, 1985), pp. 54 - 55. San Francisco's bilingual-bicultural approach to education was short-lived, and in other parts of the country the approach was adamantly rejected. A Lutheran school instructor in Nebraska, for example, was criminally prosecuted in 1923 for teaching the German language to an elementary school pupil. The United States Supreme Court overturned the conviction in the case of Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U. S. 390 (1923).

[22]Massaro, 1993, pp. 22 - 23.

[23]Bourne, Randolph S., quoted in Hansen, Olaf, (ed.), The Radical Will: Selected Writings, 1911 - 1918, (New York: Urizen Books, 1977), p. 55.

[24]ibid.

continued to publish essays on the cultural pluralist foundations of American political life. In a 1924 essay entitled "Culture and Democracy in the United States," Kalled argued a distinct view of American constitutionalism when he wrote that American culture

> is founded upon variation of racial groups and individual character, upon spontaneous differences of social heritage, institutional habit, mental attitude and emotional tone; upon the continuous, free and fruitful cross-fertilization of these by one another. Within these Many. . . lies the American One.[25]

Both Kallen's idea of the American One residing within the diverse cultures in the nation and Bourne's idea of a "cosmopolitan federation" failed to take root in American political discussion during the first half of the twentieth century. Vividly projected onto the American landscape was the Great American Melting Pot which focused on *e pluribus unum* and stressed the "Americanization" of cultural difference.[26] Although the intensity of the Americanization movement subsided under the pressures of the Great Depression and the Second World War, these events continued to demonstrate "the desperate necessity of national cohesion within the frame of shared national ideals."[27] As cultural pluralist Louis Adamic wrote to his friend Merritt

---

[25]Kallen, Horace M., Culture and Democracy in the United States: Studies in the Group Psychology of the American Peoples. (New York: Boni & Liveright, 1924), p. 24.

[26]Melting pot advocates sought to force the immigrant to become severed from his cultural heritage and lingusitic past and frequently focused their rhetoric on the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race and culture. Progressives such as Jane Addams and Frances Keller were more sympathetic to the immigrant but passionately held to the belief of immigrant assimilation (if in a less cruel manner than melting pot advocates) and as a result failed to conceive of a program that recognized the intrinsic worth and significance of traditional ethnic values. See Isser, Natalie and Lita Linzer Schwartz, The American School and the Melting Pot: Minority Self-Esteem and Public Education, (Bristol, Indiana: Wyndham Hall Press, 1985), particularly Chapter Two.

[27]Schlesinger, 1992, p. 37. It is significant to note that although the Americanization movement of the 1920s became less intense during the 1930s and 1940s, textbooks written at the end of the First World War were still a part of many curricula in the 1940s and thus transmitted to more than one generation inaccuracies, prejudices, and misinformation about certain cultures and ethnicities. Isser and Schwartz contend that the stereotypes and prejudices transmitted through public schools played a role in the incarceration of the Japanese in World War II. See Isser, Natalie and Lita Linzer Schwartz, 1985. A study made of highly educated persons in 1958 demonstrates that few adults remembered studying about Asia in school, and what they did recall

H. Perkins in 1945 (in reference to a conversation held between them in 1938):

> What was desired ultimately, you and I thought, was a reorientation of the American state of mind, or rather states of mind, merging them on some levels without suppressing their special qualities and contents, a revaluation of facts in the American Story so that Immigration might cease to be a footnote on page 317 and become a main subject in the text, so that each group in our population would be seen as a necessary and integral thread and would receive its proper stress in books, in revised attitudes and relationships. . . . The psychological civil war still goes on. . . . The issues went underground, there to seethe and gain in force like a teakettle with a plugged spout. They are almost certain to break out with increased pressure now the military war is over.[28]

As the Second World War came to a close, Americans were forced to look closely at the intellectual and practical inconsistencies of having fought a war for freedom abroad while clinging to racial and ethnic prejudice, bigotry, and oppression at home. Rhetoric designed to provide support for the United States during the war and glorify its victory afterward -- rhetoric such as the United States being the "land of the free" and the "cradle of liberty" -- stood in stark contrast to existing domestic arrangements of racial and ethnic segregation, Jim Crow laws, oppression, and prejudice. The rhetoric of liberty and freedom had the unintended effect of invigorating race and ethnic groups in the United States to plead their unfulfilled rights through the American Creed.[29] As the United States entered the second half of the twentieth century, cultural pluralism took on new meaning as American political discourse turned its attention toward what Michael

---

reflected prejudice and stereotypes of Asian peoples and culture. Isaacs, Harold R., Scratches on our Minds, (New York: John Day Co., 1958), pp. 92 - 108.

[28]Adamic, Louis, A Nation of Nations, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945), p. 5.

[29]Gunnar Myrdal's seminal work, An American Dilemma, revealed through polls of black Americans conducted with his collaborator, Ralph Bunche, that in 1944, "every man on the street - black, red, and yellow as well as white -- regarded America as the 'land of the free' and the 'cradle of liberty'." See Schlesinger, 1992, p. 39. Myrdal surmised that the American Creed meant even more to blacks, new immigrants, Jews, and other disadvantaged groups than whites since these groups "could not possibly have invented a system of political ideals which better corresponded to their interests." Myrdal, Gunnar, An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy, (New York: Harper & Bros., 1944).

Novak calls the "unmeltable ethnics."[30]

b. The Effects of the Civil Rights Movement on American Cultural Pluralist Theory

The Civil Rights Movement injected new energy and strength into cultural pluralist theory. Efforts by the black community in the 1930s and 1940s to attain social and economic equality, most actively pursued through the works of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP),[31] began to materialize with the Supreme Court's decision in Brown v. Board of Education[32] in 1954. Also, grass roots efforts by race and ethnic communities to raise the consciousness, pride, and cultural celebration of their communities provided support for group-based demands for greater social and economic equality, political participation, and representation in the electoral system.[33] As the political identity of race and ethnic groups developed and strengthened, participatory demands became more frequent and expansive and gained considerable recognition through both Supreme Court decisions and legislative

---

[30]Novak, Michael, The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics: Politics and Culture in the Seventies, (New York: Macmillan, 1972).

[31]For example, in 1931 the NAACP commissioned a study detailing the actual inequalities in segregated schools. The study, known as the Margold Report, was later used to help establish the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund from which the NAACP and the Legal Defense Fund's director, Thurgood Marshall, were to bring legal actions that would eventually bring an end to racially segregated schools.

[32]Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U. S. 483 (1954).

[33]For a discussion of group consciousness in grass roots efforts for participation see Miller, Arthur H., Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin, and Oksana Malanchuk, "Group Consciousness and Political Participation," American Journal of Political Science, August 1981, vol. 25, no. 3, p. 494. See also Carmichael , Stokely and Charles V. Hamilton, Black Power: The Politics of Liberatin in America, (New York: Random House, 1967), p. 87. For a discussion of representation and participation as the focus of the early Civil Rights Movement, see Guinier, Lani, The Tyranny of the Manority: Fundamental Fairness in Representative Democracy, (New York: The Free Press, 1994); Delaney, Martin R., "The Political Destiny of the Colored Race," in Stuckey, Sterling, (ed.), The Ideological Origins of Black Nationalism, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), pp. 195, 197 - 198; Preston, Michael B., Lenneal J. Henderson, Jr., and Paul Puryear, (eds.), The New Black Politics: The Search for Political Power, (New York: Longman, 1982).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

enactments.[34] Other race and ethnic groups in the United States were invigorated by the impact of black demands for legal and legislative reform and attached their own set of demands to the Civil Rights Movement's rhetoric of equality. The movement, Martha Minow writes:

> shaped political and legal rhetoric while strengthening a moral claim demanding that majorities respect the rights and needs of minorities. Rather than aspiring to merge in the melting pot, new groups of immigrants by the 1970s were claiming ethnic pride and demanding that language and cultural education respect the heritage of minority groups.[35]

Heightened awareness of race and ethnic pride and group demands for equality during the Civil Rights Movement had a significant impact on cultural pluralist theory. Whereas prior to the 1950s the works of the early cultural pluralists received little attention, after 1950 the writings of Horace Kallen became widely studied and cited. An example of the academy's newfound interest

---

[34]The demand for greater participation was reflected in and greatly influenced by the Supreme Court's opinion in the Reapportionment Cases of 1964 and the congressional enactment of both the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act in 1965. In the lead reapportionment case, Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U. S. 533 (1964), the Court held that the Fourteenth Amendment's equal protection clause guarantees to each citizen an equal weight in the election of state legislators, and the reapportionment cases together effectively declared the apportionment of every state legislature unconstitutional. See Baker, Gordon E., "Reynolds v. Sims," entry in Kermit L. Hall, (ed.), The Oxford Companion to the Supreme Court of the United States, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 732 - 734. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 provided federal administrative and judicial remedies against racial and other group-based kinds of discrimination in public accommodations and in employment. See Sedler, Robert A., "Civil Rights Act of 1964," entry in Kermit L. Hall, (ed.), ibid, p 148. The Voting Rights Act enacted a complex statutory web of federal monitoring of local elections to ensure protected racial minorities the right to vote on an equal basis with other members of the population. Among other things, the act required administrative preclearance of all election law changes in targeted areas and barred southern jurisdictions from implementing new schemes that would evade the reach of case-by-case adjudication. See Guinier, Lani, "Keeping the Faith: Black Voters in the Post-Reagan Era," Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, Spring, 1989, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 393 - 435, reprinted Guinier, Lani, 1992, pp. 21 - 40.

[35]Minow, Martha, Making All the Difference: Inclusion, Exclusion, and American Law, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), p. 27.

in cultural pluralist theory is represented in an invitation extended to Kallen in the spring of 1954[36] by the Albert M. Greenfield Center for Human Relations of the University of Pennsylvania to deliver two lectures on cultural pluralism.[37] In one lecture entitled "Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea," Kallen demonstrated his continued and ardent commitment to the idea that the United States was a nation constituted of interacting cultural groups.

> What else, indeed, can 'the pursuit of happiness' consist in?. . . . Must it not be the cultivation of an art of life, guided by faith and worked out by patterned conduct, the two together creating an individual biography or a communal history, the linkage of whose events is a practical orchestration of an imaginative vision of nature, man, and man's destiny? And if the pursuit of happiness be this, then the pursuit of happiness is the creation of cultures and the sporting union of their diversities as peers and equals; it is the endeavor after culture as each communion and each community, according to its own singularity of form and function, envisions its own cultural individuality and struggles to preserve, enrich, and perfect it by means of free commerce in thoughts and things with all mankind. Cultural pluralism signalizes the harmonies of this commerce at home and abroad. It designates that orchestration of the cultures of mankind which alone can be worked and fought for with least injustice, and with least suppression of frustration of any culture, local, occupational, national or international, by any other.[38]

The subject of rather sudden academic interest, Kallen's theory became open to criticism and intellectual interrogation. A primary criticism of early- and mid-century cultural pluralism was that despite its group- and community-based rhetoric, it remained strongly attached to the Enlightenment idea of the primacy of the individual. Contemporary cultural pluralist Michael

---

[36]It is interesting to note that while Kallen's first essay coincided with the sinking of the *Lucitania*, his invitation to lecture at the University of Pennsylvania in the spring of 1954 coincided with the Supreme Court announcing its decision in Brown v. Board of Education in May 1954.

[37]Kallen's lectures and accompanying commentaries by leading scholars from a variety of disciplines were compiled and published by the Greenfield Center. See Kallen, Horace M., Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea: An Essay in Social Philosophy, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956).

[38]Kallen, Horace, "Cultural Pluralism and the America Idea," in Kallen, Horace M., Cultural Pluralism and the America Idea: An Essay in Social Philosophy, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956), pp. 56 - 100, cite at p. 100.

Walzer writes that the early theorists, specifically Kallen, Bourne, and Adamic, did not produce a fully satisfying account of the relation between the political one and the cultural many because their arguments:

> rarely advanced much beyond glowing description and polemical assertion. Drawing heavily upon nineteenth-century romanticism, they insisted upon the intrinsic value of human difference and, more plausibly and importantly, upon the deep need of human beings for historically and communally structured forms of life. Every kind of regimentation, every kind of uniformity was alien to them. They were the self-appointed guardians of a society of groups, a society resting upon stable families (despite the disruptions of the immigrant experience), tied into, bearing, and transmitting powerful cultural traditions. At the same time, their politics was little more than an unexamined liberalism. Freedom for individuals, they were certain, was all that was necessary to uphold group identification and ethnic flourishing.[39]

The foundations for a revised cultural pluralist theory were provided through an American political discourse that during the Civil Rights Movement expanded to include a variety of narratives and perspectives from groups and individuals previously excluded from discussions of national culture and the ideals of national life.[40] The most eloquent expressions of these "new" approaches to and perspectives of national life were provided through discussions among black nationalists and black integrationists in the late 1960s and early 1970s.[41] In confronting the

---

[39]Walzer, Michael, What It Means to Be an American, (New York: Marsilio Press, 1992), pp. 63 - 64.

[40]For an excellent collection of the works produced by persons historically "situated at the boundaries," see Storing, Herbert J., What Country Have I? Political Writings by Black Americans, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970).

[41]The black community was divided during the Civil Rights Movement on the degree to which integration should be pursued. Integrationists consistently sought to eliminate restrictions that kept blacks from participating fully in society's mainstream while black nationalists rejected integration as a hoax, were suspicious of alliances with whites, and advocated self-help community based empowerment. See Guinier, Lani, "The Triumph of Tokenism: The Voting Rights Act and the Theory of Black Electoral Success," Michigan Law Review, March 1991, vol. 89, no. 5, pp. 1077 - 1154, reprinted in Guinier, Lani, 1994, pp. 41 - 70. For an example of the integrationist position, see King, Martin Luther, Jr., The Trumpet of Conscience, (New York: Harper & Row, 1967). For an example of the nationalist position, see Carmichael, Stokely and

question of whether to separate or integrate, black scholars and political activists turned to historical and contemporary black writers for insights and understandings into the black cultural experience and contributed to cultural pluralist theory by adding not only historical narratives to American political discussion but also the unique narratives of contemporary black scholars, activists, and leaders.[42] W. E. B. Dubois, for example, a lifelong sympathizer of cultural pluralism,[43] wrote that if "there is substantial agreement in laws, language, and religion" and a "satisfactory adjustment of economic life," then "there is no reason why in the same country and on the same street, two or three great national ideals may not thrive and develop."[44] Dubois defended cultural pluralism on three grounds: It inspired black pride; maintained black cultural

---

Charles V. Hamilton, Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America, (New York: Random House, 1967). Despite sometimes heated debate between integrationists and nationalists, many black nationalists played an important role in the fight for the franchise, reflecting their "admiration" for America's "free institutions." See Barnett, Marguerite R., "A Theoretical Perspective on American Racial Public Policy," in Barnett, Marguerite R. and James A. Hefner, (eds.), Public Policy for the Black Community, (Port Washington, New York: Alfred Publishing, 1976), pp. 1 - 53. For both integrationists and nationalists, the struggle for effective use of the ballot became the "number one civil right." See Delany, Martin R., in Stuckey, 1972, pp. 195 - 236.

[42]The historical writings added to cultural pluralist discussion during the 1960s and 1970s included those of Fredrick Douglass, an black integrationist of the nineteenth century, who at one time considered the problem of overcoming imposed segregation through voluntary segregation. See Boxill, Bernard R., "Separation or Assimilation?," in Arthur, John, and Amy Shapiro, (eds.), Campus Wars: Multiculturalism and the Politics of Difference, (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995), pp. 235 - 248. Contemporary writers included W. E. B. Dubois who argued that internal self-organization was the "only effective defense against complete spiritual and physical disaster;" but that internal self-organization involved "more or less active segregation and acquiescence in segregation." Dubois, W. E. B., "Separation and Self-Respect," in Lester, Julius, (ed.), The Seventh Son: The Thought and Writing of W. E. B. Dubois, (New York: Vantage Books, 1971), pp. 237, 247.

[43]Boxill, 1995, p. 235.

[44]Dubois, W. E. B., "The Conservation of Races," in Brontz, Howard (ed.), Negro Social and Political Thought 1850 - 1920, Representative Texts, (New York: Basic Books, 1966), p. 488.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

authenticity; and gave to the world the gift of black culture.[45] Dubois, along with other black writers and leaders such as Stokely Carmichael,[46] Charles V. Hamilton,[47] Martin Luther King, Jr.,[48] and James Baldwin,[49] helped Black America to gain a unified voice from which to articulate and assert cultural and political demands in American political discourse.

Using Walzer's "ethnic self-assertion" model for understanding cultural pluralism,[50] three features of contemporary cultural pluralist theory emerged as a result of the Civil Rights Movement. First, cultural pluralism came to advocate the defense of cultures against majority tendencies toward cultural naturalization and assimilation.[51] Second, it came to view the celebration of cultural identity as central to the process by which historically oppressed groups seek recovery and rebirth and based on this understanding to advocate the right of cultural groups to identity celebration.[52] Third, it came to argue that cultures have a right to build and sustain their communities: to create institutions, gain control of resources, and provide educational and

---

[45]Boxill, 1995, p. 238.

[46]For example, see Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967.

[47]For example, see Hamilton, Charles V., The Black Experience in American Politics, (New York: Putnam, 1973).

[48]For example, see King, Martin Luther, Jr., The Trumpet of Conscience, (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).

[49]Baldwin, James, "Stranger in the Village," in Storing, 1970, pp. 215 - 225.

[50]See Walzer, What it Means to Be an American, 1992, pp. 64 - 66. Walzer's "ethnic self-assertion" model for understanding cultural pluralism does not directly hold that the civil rights movement produced these features of contemporary cultural pluralism. Rather, he constructs the ethnic self-assertion model to demonstrate what the protagonists of cultural pluralism have done or tried to do nationally and internationally and argues that cultural pluralism is itself best understood in these terms. In the literature on multiculturalism and cultural pluralism, Walzer's model proves the most illuminating account of the effects of group self-assertion on cultural pluralist theory, and for this reason I have adopted Walzer's model as a model for describing the American experience during the 1960s and 1970s and its effect on cultural pluralist theory.

[51]ibid, p. 64.

[52]ibid, p. 65.

welfare services for their communities.[53] In addition to its direct impact on cultural pluralist theory, the Civil Rights Movement's focus on equal rights and its demand for the acceptance, recognition, and celebration of cultural difference served generally to expand American political discourse. In the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s, the rhetoric of equal rights expanded to include demands from a wide range of diverse groups in American society including women, persons with disabilities, aging Americans, gay men, and lesbians. Whereas during the Civil Rights Movement political rhetoric concentrated heavily on the rights of historically oppressed groups including women, blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans, by the mid-1980s the issues of equality and cultural recognition had expanded to include a wide range of ethnic and race groups as well as groups based on sexual preference, age, disability status, and other shared experiences.

The Civil Rights Movement was marked not only by a rhetoric of equal rights and a celebration of race, ethnicity, and culture, but also by an accompanying interest in theoretical models of social existence and identity formation. As Peters writes, the philosophies of decolonization and feminism, which drew heavily from Marxist critiques of the collective subject making history under conditions giving priority to class and in part from the Freudian critique of the unconscious processes at work in the formation of the self, injected into American political discourse a politics of differentiation that served to further erode the idea of a homogeneous collective unity of nation.[54] The idea of a unity of nation, prevalent throughout the first half of the twentieth century, was replaced during the Civil Rights Movement with the idea of a highly differentiated nation comprised of a multitude of collective social identities most of whom were united through a common experience of oppression, discrimination, inequality, and prejudice.

The gains in personal and individual rights made during the Civil Rights Movement appeared contradictory to the group-based rhetoric of the era. While much of the rhetoric of the Civil Rights Movement focused on group-based demands, the theoretical foundations of the movement resided in what Peters calls the "old logic of identity." The old logic of identity

---

[53]ibid, p. 66.

[54]See Peters, 1996.

> conceived of collective subjects in terms of stable, essential and homogeneous categories. These essentializing views . . . reduced emerging collective social identities to the model of the individual imperial self where differences became subsumed and internal conflicts were eliminated. Questions of oppression within or between oppressed groups were occluded in the romanticization of collective actors who were seen to act, think, and feel as one.[55]

Poststructuralism's critique of the Civil Rights Movement was one focused on the non-differentiation of individuals within groups rather than the differentiation of individual and group. The philosophies of the Civil Rights Movement that asserted class, race, and gender to break apart the notion of a unity of nation reified the notion of nation by replicating within groups a concept of homogeneity from which the attack on national unity had been waged. In the old logic of identity, for example, the idea of a "community of women," united in the cause of equal rights and through a shared experience in economic, legal, and other types of oppression, failed according to poststructuralist theory to take account of the race, class, ethnic, sexual orientation, age, and other differences that might constitute the identities of women in the gendered community.

c. The Effects of Poststructuralist Thought on American Cultural Pluralist Theory

The incursion of French poststructuralist theory in United States universities in the late 1970s and 1980s challenged the old logic of identity and provided a theoretical framework from which to launch a new "politics of difference" in American political discourse. Various theoretical models for rethinking culture such as Saussurean semiotics, Lacanian psychoanalysis, and cultural studies emphasizing the deconstruction of binary oppositions (such as black/white, colonizer/colonized, male/female, civilized/primitive) provided new understanding into the subtle processes of identity formation and the ways in which "modernist, Eurocentric discourses have created nations, races and classes through a series of systematic exclusions based on binary

---

[55]Peters, 1996, pp. 189 - 190.

oppositions."[56] Poststructuralist critique of reason and the subject was instrumental in unsettling the modernist discourse of identity and the politics on which it was based.[57] The unsettling of the modernist discourse was performed by poststructuralist theory by its

> problematizing the category of the individual as the last vestige of a rationalistic liberalism that [had] privileged the Cogito -- the self-identitical and fully transparent thinking subject, the origin and ground of action -- as *the* universal subject against which all irrational others are defined. It carried out this critique in a way that problematized not only the unity of the subject but also that of any group, which, on the basis of an alleged shared experience, may have been thought of as an organic unity or singular actor.[58]

Theoretical focus on identity formation had the effect of producing in American political discourse a new conceptualization of community based on "a shift from the idea of inherited or imposed authority and towards the principles of difference and dialogue."[59] The shift toward difference and dialogue served to undermine the notion of community as understood in terms of normative identity and tradition and to emphasize, in the words of Donald and Rattansi, 'the contingency of *any* cultural authority."[60]

In political terms, poststructuralism served to interrogate the notion of a homogeneous, collective unity of group in a way similar to the interrogation of national unity that had been conducted through decolonization and feminist theories during the Civil Rights Movement. In denying claims to universality, universal experience, and universal culture and in stressing the contingency of all cultural authority, poststructuralist thought provided American politics with a

---

[56]ibid, p. 190.

[57]Peters, Michael, "Postmodernism: The Critique of Reason and the Rise of the New Social Movements," Sites: A Journal for Radical Perspectives on Culture, 1991, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 142 - 160.

[58]Peters, Michael, 1996, p. 187. Emphasis in the original.

[59]Donald, James and Ali Rattansi, "Race," Culture and Difference, (London: Sage, 1992), p. 5.

[60]Donald, James and Ali Rattansi, 1992, p. 5. Emphasis in the original.

theory of group identity that potentially allowed all self-identified groups a voice in political discussion and provided an intellectual framework from which to launch a new "politics of difference" based on the fluid and relational processes of group and individual identity formation.

The Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and 1970s and the incursion of French poststructuralist thought in American universities in the 1970s and 1980s was to have a profound effect on cultural pluralist theory. The Civil Rights Movement directly impacted cultural pluralist theory in at least three ways: it brought traditional cultural pluralist theory into popular academic discussion, it expanded academic and political discussion to include a variety of narratives and perspectives on American life and national ideals, and it transformed traditional cultural pluralist theory into a highly political group-conscious theory. The Civil Rights Movement indirectly effected cultural pluralist theory by focusing public attention on the cultural heterogeneity of the United States and injecting American political discourse with systematic theories of culture based on race, ethnicity, and gender differences. Poststructuralist thought served to further expand the idea of the nation as heterogeneous by presenting theories of identity based on difference and dialogue and in stressing the contingency of all cultural authority. Together, the Civil Rights Movement and poststructuralist thought produced in American political discourse a wide range of theories that commonly embraced the cultural pluralist ideal of the United States as comprised of several distinct but equally valuable groups, commmunities, and cultures.

II. Multiculturalism in Contemporary American Political Discourse

The pluralist image of American life presented in social science literature prior to the mid-1960s was almost exclusively one of interest group pluralism which views the nation as comprised of interest groups checking each other in power dimensions.[61] The term "cultural pluralism" did

---

[61]The democratic pluralist model, represented in the works of Robert Dahl, holds that power resides in a variety of groups with different interests. The elitist model, represented in the works of C. Wright Mills, holds that power is centralized in interlocking structures of national decisionmaking composed of a "power elite" of corporate, military, and government elites. For examples of interest group pluralism literature, see Dahl, Robert A. and Charles E. Lindblom, Politics, Economics and Welfare, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953); Dahl, Robert, Who Governs?, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961); Latham, Earl, The Group Basis of Politics,

not openly appear in American political discourse until 1964 when Milton Gordon's book Assimilation in American Life made the term relatively popular.[62] The idea of the nation as comprised of distinct cultural groups gained further attention after the Watts riots of 1965 and during the period of violence that wracked the United States between 1965 and 1970.[63] These events generated considerable interest in theories of racial and ethnic pluralism and cast belated attention on a 1963 study by Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan of the strength of ethnicity in modern life.[64] Cultural pluralism and interest group pluralism served as the dominant models of social and political life in the United States throughout the 1970s and 1980s and continue to hold considerable following among social scientists today.[65]

When the term "multiculturalism" first appeared in American political discourse in the mid-1970s,[66] it was used synonymously and interchangably with the term cultural pluralism. Throughout the 1970s and most of the 1980s, the meaning of both multiculturalism and cultural pluralism was largely constructed around recognition and acceptance of race and ethnic diversity

---

(Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1952); Polsby, Nelson, Community Power and Political Theory, (rev.ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980); Dahrendorf, Ralf, Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society, (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1959); Mills, C. Wright, The Power Elite, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956).

[62]Morgan, Gordon D., America without Ethnicity, (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1981), p. 103. Also see Gordon, Milton M., Assimilation in American Life, (NY: Oxford University Press, 1964).

[63]Morgan, 1981, p. 103.

[64]Glazer, Nathan and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negros, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City, (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1963).

[65]Morgan offers an illuminating discussion of the differences between cultural pluralist theory and interest group pluralist theory. See Morgan, 1981, particularly pp. 83 - 90.

[66]It is difficult to determine precisely when the term "multiculturalism" first appeared in American political discourse; however, a review of bibliographies of educational texts and handbooks indicates that the term began to prominently appear in the titles of these works in the mid-1970s.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in public schooling[67] and generally represented the idea that culture could be used as a vehicle for resolving racial inequality and antagonism in public education.[68] Multicultural education reform in the 1970s and 1980s eventually came to stress not only race and ethnic studies[69] but also the role

---

[67]Many educational reform proposals during this time identified culture as a primary vehicle for the resolution of racial inequality and racial antagonism in schooling. See McCarthy, Cameron, Race and Curriculum: Social Inequality and the Theories of Politics of Difference in Contemporary Research on Schooling, (New York: Falmer Press, 1990). For examples of the interchangeable meaning of "multiculturalism" and "cultural pluralism" in education reform literature, see Banks, James, Multicultural Education: Theory and Practice, (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1981). Banks demonstrates the political meanings associated with cultural pluralism when he argues that the cultural pluralist sees the United States as

> made up of competing ethnic groups, each of which champions its economic and political interests. It is extremely important, argues the pluralist, for the individual to develop a commitment to his or her ethnic group, especially if that group is 'oppressed' by more powerful ethnic groups in American society.

Banks, 1981, p. 62. For other examples, see Gold, Milton J., Carl A. Grant, Harry N. Rivlin, (eds.), In Praise of Diversity: A Resource Book for Multicutural Education, (Washington, D. C.: Teacher Corps, 1977), a book largely comprised of "ethnic vignettes" to assist teachers in multicultural education. See also Tiedt, Iris and Pamela Tiedt, Multicultural Teaching: A Handbook of Activities, Information, and Resources, (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1986), which includes activities for students to identify cultural traits of different ethnic groups and encourges the acceptance and recognition of these traits and cultural differences. Another example of educational programs designed to enhance school childrens' recognition of cultural difference is the popular teaching kit "The Wonderful World of Difference," which explores "the diversity and richness of the human family." The Wonderful World of Difference: A Human Relations Program for Grades K-8, (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1986).

[68]McCarthy, 1990. Banks argues that educational response to racial and ethnic tension in the nation occurred as early as the 1950s, through "intergroup education" projects sponsored by organizations such as the Progressive Education Association, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the American Council on Education. See Banks, James A., "Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice," in Banks, James A. and Cherry A. McGee Banks, Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education, (New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1995), p. 8.

[69]Works such as W. E. B. DuBois' The Education of Black People: Ten Critiques, 1906 - 1960, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973), Vine Deloria, Jr.'s Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto, (New York: Avon, 1969), Rudy Acuna's Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation, (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1972), Harry H. I. Kitano's Japanese

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of pedagogy in achieving economic and social equality for women and incorporating the issues and experiences of women into American political discourse.[70]

Multiculturalism continued to be understood largely in terms of race, ethnicity, and gender until the late 1980s when core curriculum arguments appeared in American political discourse. Core curriculum arguments, with their emphasis on forging a common cultural base consisting of a specific set of language, knowledge, customs, myths, values, and beliefs, drew sharp response from multiculturalist scholars who viewed the core curriculum as a means of subjecting minority cultures and peoples to the history, conventions, practices, and beliefs of a hegemonic, white, Eurocentric culture. The multiculturalist response assumed two general forms. First, in countering the cultural universalism inherent in the core curriculum, theoretical arguments were offered that emphasized the relationship between knowledge and power, the political construction of first principles, and the historical forces in American social, political, and economic life that

---

Americans, (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1969), and Michael Novak's The Rise of the Unmentable Ethnics, (New York: Macmillan, 1971) became required reading in ethnic studies courses and degree programs. See Banks, in Banks and Banks, 1995, p. 10.

[70]Women's studies programs in higher education proliferated during the 1970s. The first program was established at San Diego State University in 1969, and by 1977 over 275 programs were registered nationwide. See Schmitz, Betty, Johnnella E. Butler, Deborah Rosenfelt, Beverly Guy-Sheftall, "Women's Studies and Curriculum Transformation," in Banks and Banks, 1995, p. 709. Literature produced of the Civil Rights Movement that emphasized gender relationships generally sought to evaluate and transform the traditional knowledge bases of American society in ways that accounted for how social, legal, and economic structures impacted women. See, for example, Bartlett, Katharine T., "Feminist Legal Methods," Harvard Law Review, February 1990, vol. 103, no. 4, pp. 829 - 888; Gilligan, Carol, In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982); Belenky, Mary F., Blythe M. Clinchy, Nancy R. Goldberger, and Jill M. Tarule, Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind, (New York: Basic Books, 1986); MacKinnon, Catharine A., Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987); MacKinnon, Catharine A., Toward a Feminist Theory of the State, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989). Other feminist literature focuses on the ways in which class, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation intersect with gender. For examples, see Hull, Gloria T., Patricia B. Scott, and Barbara Smith (eds.), All the Women are White, All the Blacks are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave, (New York: Feminist Press, 1982); Moraga, Cherry, and Gloria Anzaldua (eds.), This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color, (Watertown, M. A.: Persephone Press, 1981).

served to perpetuate hierarchical arrangements of power.[71] Second, practical responses were offered through political discussion and legislative debate that stressed the importance of cultural diversity in American education. Practical responses to the core curriculum[72] included arguments that education policies should respect and accomodate the child's home culture,[73] that curriculum should be supplemented to include texts and teachings that depart from the national monocultural ideal,[74] and that a revised American history should be taught progressively and politically.[75]

Prior to the introduction of core curriculum arguments, the term multiculturalism was typically used in American political discourse to refer to a general belief in the desirability of recognizing and respecting race, ethnic, and gender difference in American society. After the introduction of core curriculum arguments, the meaning of multiculturalism came to be constructed largely

---

[71]For an example of the multiculturalist critique of the political construction of first principles see Richard Rorty, "That Old-Time Philosophy," The New Republic, April 4, 1988, vol. 198, no. 14, pp. 28 - 34. Rorty writes that first principles are

> just a set of abbreviations of, rather than justifications for, a set of beliefs about the desirability of certain concrete alternatives over others; the source of these beliefs is not 'reason' or 'nature' but rather the prevalence of certain institutions or modes of life in the past.

Rorty, 1988, p. 30. For compelling accounts of the interdependence of institututional power and its common foundation of violence, see Cover, Robert, "Violence and the Word," Yale Law Journal, July 1986, vol. 95, no. 8, pp. 1601 - 1629; and Cover, Robert, "Foreward: Nomos and Narrative," Harvard Law Review, November 1983, vol. 97, no. 1, pp. 4 - 68.

[72]The practical responses to core curriculum arguments are set forth in Massaro, 1993.

[73]See, for example, Banks, James A. and Cherry A. McGee Banks, (eds.), Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives, 3rd ed., (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1997); Wurzel, Jamie S., (ed.), Toward Multiculturalism: A Reader in Multicultural Education, (Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press, Inc., 1988).

[74]See, for example, Baldwin, James, "A Talk to Teachers," in Simonson, Rick and Scott Walker, (eds.), The Graywolf Annual Five: Multicultural Literacy, (St. Paul: Graywolf Press, 1988), pp. 3 - 12.

[75]See, for example, Mura, David, "Strangers in the Village," in Simonson and Walker, 1988, pp. 135 - 153.

around its opposition to the core curriculum and understood in terms of what multiculturalism was *not*, namely, monoculturalism and assimilationism. The negative associational meaning of the term multiculturalism was exacerbated by a widespread rhetoric in American public policy discussion in the late 1980s and early 1990s that centered on national unity and cultural assimilation,[76] and many proposals for policy reform relating to the appreciation of cultural diversity and difference were presented as "radical" departures from the monocultural American ideal.

Multiculturalist literature offered little in the way of a unified theory to counter this negative rhetorical assault. True to the principles of cultural pluralism, multiculturalists were unable to openly present a unified vision of exactly what multiculturalism stood for other than the general idea that the United States should pursue policies that respected cultural diversity and pluralism. A more exacting definition would have opened multiculturalism to its own criticisms of monoculturalism and collided with both the cultural pluralist principle of respect for cultural difference advanced during the Civil Rights Movement and the poststructuralist idea of the contingency of cultural authority. Thus, by 1994 even multiculturalists were defining multiculturalism in terms of its opposition to monoculturalism.[77]

The united front presented by multiculturalism in its advocacy for cultural pluralist principles and opposition to the core curriculum served to conceal debates that existed and continue to exist

---

[76]The most visible push toward national unity during the 1980s is represented in the Official English Movement. Among the many efforts to make English the official national language, Senator S. I. Hayakawa introduced the first proposal to declare English the nation's official language in 1981and in 1983 co-founded the organization U. S. English, a powerful and highly funded lobby. California passed the first Official English measure by ballot initiative in 1986 and the following year Official English measures were considered in 37 state legislatures (and passed in five). See Draper, Jamie B. and Martha Jimenez, "Language Debates in the United States: A Decade in Review," EPIC Events, 1990, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 1 - 7, reprinted in Crawford, 1992, pp. 89 - 94.

[77]See, for example, Goldberg, David Theo, (ed.), Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994). Goldberg writes in the introduction to this edited collection of multiculturalist essays: "Broadly defined, multiculturalism is critical of and resistant to the necessarily reductive imperatives of monocultural assimilation." Goldberg, David Theo, "Introduction: Multicultural Conditions," in Goldberg, David Theo, 1994, p. 7.

within multiculturalism. Two mutually informing categories of argument capture the debates internal to multiculturalism. One category delineates between what Christine Sleeter calls the "liberal" and "radical" positions on inequality.[78] A second and related category of argument delineates between what M. M. Slaughter calls the "essentialist" and "constructionist" theories of political identity.[79]

a. Liberal and Radical Positions on Inequality in Multiculturalist Literature

The liberal position on inequality generally holds that a history of discrimination exists in the United States against categories of people and that prejudice and stereotyping interfere with individuals' attempts to pursue opportunities.[80] The radical position on inequality rejects the individual as the main unit of analysis and holds that most social behavior is structured by groups rather than individuals. A variety of arguments are presented in multiculturalist literature relating to the respective positions on inequality and the related question of how political identity is constructed.

Liberal multiculturalist theory seeks to construct a universal grammar that translates across cultures to provide a common language for national transcultural discourse. In her book Democratic Education and in a subsequent article entitled "The Challenge of Multiculturalism in Political Ethics," Amy Gutmann argues that certain liberal political principles such as life, liberty, and opportunity serve the moral equivalent of a set of universal beliefs that translates across cultures.[81] Gutmann's work, along with the influential writings of Canadian philosopher Charles

---

[78]Sleeter, Christine, "An Analysis of the Critiques of Multicultural Education," in Banks, and Banks, 1995, pp. 81 - 96.

[79]Slaughter, M. M., "The Multicultural Self: Questions of Subjectivity, Questions of Power, " in Rosenfeld, Michel, (ed.), Constitutionalism, Identity, Difference, and Legitimacy: Theoretical Perspectives, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), pp. 369 - 382.

[80]Sleeter, in Banks and Banks, 1995, p. 82.

[81]Gutmann constructs a transcultural grammar she terms "deliberative universalism" based on the liberal principles of life, liberty, and opportunity. See Gutmann, Amy, Democratic

Taylor,[82] have produced in multiculturalist literature a liberal alliance based on a common understanding of multiculturalism as rooted in the traditions of liberal democracy. Represented in Gutmann's edited work Multiculturalism and 'The Politics of Recognition,'[83] liberal multiculturalism implicitly seeks to articulate the specific principles of liberalism that a universal transcultural grammar should contain.

Elaborating on Taylor's notion of contemporary liberalism as comprised of two variants, the "politics of equal dignity" and the the "politics of difference,"[84] Michael Walzer delineates two types of liberalism. In "Liberalism 1," the democratic state is neutral as to the diverse and often conflicting conceptions of the good life held by citizens of a pluralistic society. In "Liberalism 2," the state is permitted to further particular cultural values provided that it protects the basic rights of citizens, ensures that no one is manipulated or coerced into accepting the cultural values represented by public institutions, and ensures that cultural choices are made in a way that is democratically acceptable in both principle and practice.[85] Walzer's types of liberalism are represented in liberal multiculturalist literature through what are known as the "difference-blind" and "difference-conscious" approaches to education policy. Difference-blind approaches seek to eliminate group-based differences from American consciousness by visualizing a nation in which the race and gender of an individual hold the functional equivalent of eye color in our society today.[86] Biological differences in the ideal society would continue to exist but the values and

---

Education, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987); and Gutmann, Amy, "The Challenge of Multiculturalism in Political Ethics," Philosophy and Public Affairs, Summer 1993, vol. 22, no. 31, pp. 171 - 206.

[82]See Taylor, Charles, Sources of the Self, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989); and Taylor, Charles, The Ethics of Authenticity, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992).

[83]Gutmann, Amy, (ed.), Multiculturalism and 'The Politics of Recognition', (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

[84]Taylor, Charles, "The Politics of Recognition," in Gutman, 1992, pp. 25 - 73.

[85]Walzer, Michael, "Comment," in Gutmann, 1992, pp. 99 - 103.

[86]See Wasserstrom, Richard, Philosophy and Social Issues, (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1980), pp. 23 - 43.

judgments assigned to these differences by society would cease to exist. This approach is reflected in the writings of Shelby Steele who argues that campus moves toward affirmative action and race- and culturally-based curricula perpetuate the idea that all minority students suffer victimization.[87] Steele writes:

> Difference that does not rest on a clearly delineated foundation of commonality is not only inaccessible to those who are not part of the ethnic or racial group, but also antagonistic to them. Difference can enrich only the common ground.[88]

The difference-conscious approach defends group-conscious policies such as affirmative action and an expanded curricula to promote equality for and representation of historically oppressed and excluded groups in the existing social, economic, and political structures of American society. A variety of arguments have been presented for why liberal difference-conscious policies should be pursued. One argument is that multiculturalist policies expose children to similar materials that promote the tenets of cultural appreciation and tolerance and thereby allow children to more fully participate and succeed in the mainstream.[89] A second argument is that students taught in their own racial or ethnic group's culture, history, literature and, in some instances, language, are reinforced in their unique identity and heritage and are thereby empowered to move "beyond the sidelines of America's landscape of opportunity."[90] A third argument is that schemes such as large-scale affirmative action produce an intelligensia that can help subordinated cultural communities gain access to resources needed for participation in America's economic and

---

[87]Steele, Shelby, The Content of Our Character: A New Vision of Race in America, (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1990); sections reprinted in Arthur and Shapiro, 1995, pp. 176 - 187.

[88]ibid, p. 187.

[89]See Singer, Alan, "Reflections on Multiculturalism," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1994, vol. 76, no. 4, pp. 284 - 289.

[90]Moran, Rachel F., "Diversity in Education," Focus on Law Studies, Spring 1996, vol. 11, no. 9, p. 8.

bureaucratic markets.[91]

The radical position on inequality derives in part from the democratic theories of Laclau and Mouffe[92] and seeks to construct a political theory for elevating the position of oppressed groups in American society. One strategy of radical multiculturalism concerns the role of multicultural education. In her edited volume Empowerment through Multicultural Education, Sleeter writes that education is a means of empowering oppressed groups through collective action based on common interests. "Members of traditionally dominant groups," she contends, "cannot be the main definers of what empowerment means, what its agendas are, and how it is to be implemented."[93] The volume is therefore dedicated to questions of what empowerment entails, which forms of action are most advantageous to oppressed groups, and what common interests these groups hold.[94]

A second example of the radical position on inequality is presented in the writings of Iris Young. Young argues that a radical position requires the assertion of a positive sense of difference by oppressed groups and a principle of special rights for such groups.[95] Best

---

[91]Kennedy, Duncan, "A Cultural Pluralist Case for Affirmative Action in Legal Academia," Duke Law Journal, September 1990, vol. 1990, no. 4, pp. 705 - 757, reprinted in Arthur and Shapiro, 1995, pp. 153 - 175. Kennedy also argues in this article that affirmative action would improve the quality and social value of scholarship in the United States.

[92]Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe, Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics, (London: Verso, 1984). See also Mouffe, Chantal, (ed.), Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community, (London: Verso, 1992), and Moufee, Chantal, "Radical Democracy: Modern or Postmodern?" in Andrew Ross (ed.,), Universal Abandon? The Politics of Postmodernism, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988), pp. 45 - 52.

[93]Sleeter, Christine E., Empowerment Through Multicultural Education, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), p. 8. See also Sleeter, Christine E. and Peter L. McLaren, Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Difference, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995).

[94]Sleeter, Christine E., 1991, p. 8.

[95]Young, Iris, "Social Movements and the Politics of Difference," in Arthur and Shapiro, 1995, pp. 199 - 225.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

understood in terms of what Young calls democratic cultural pluralism, the radical position involves an ideal of liberation that seeks to consolidate oppressed groups around a common experience of oppression. Young writes:

> Groups experiencing cultural imperialism have found themselves objectified and marked with a devalued essence from the outside, by a dominant culture they are excluded from making. The assertion of a positive sense of group difference by these groups is emanicipatory because it reclaims the definition of the group by the group, as a creation and construction, rather than a given essence. . . . These movements engage in the project of cultural revolution, . . . insofar as they take culture as in part a matter of collective choice.[96]

Inherent in much of the literature in radical multiculturalism is a concern for class structures in American society. Multiculturalist literature that incorporates class analyses generally stresses the existence of economically dominant and subordinate classes and cultures in American society and seeks to diminish or eradicate class differences among groups.[97] A particularly relevant body of arguments contained in multiculturalist literature argues that cultural pluralism needs to be injected with a model of economic power and competition among cultural groups in American society. Stephen Steinberg, author of The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America, writes that American cultural pluralism "assumes a basic equality among constituent groups" and

---

[96]ibid, p. 210.

[97]For a comprehensive discussion of economic, Marxist, and neo-Marxist education reform, see McCarthy, 1990. For specific arguments in multiculturalist literature dealing with economic-based education reform, see Apple, Michael W., "The Other Side of the Hidden Curriculum: Correspondence Theories and the Labor Process," Journal of Education, Winter 1980, vol. 162, no. 1, 47 - 66; Connell, R. W., Making the Difference: Schools, Families, and Social Division, (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1982); Kozol, Jonathan, Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools, (New York: Crown Publishers, 1991); Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America, (New York: Basic Books, 1976); Edari, Ronald S., "Racial Minorities and Forms of Ideological Mystification," in Berlowitz, Marvin J. and Ronald S. Edari, (eds.), Racism and the Denial of Human Rights: Beyond Ethnicity, (Minneapolis: Marxist Educational Press, 1984), pp. 7 - 18.

"devotes remarkably little space to the problem of inequality."[98] Gordon Morgan extends Steinberg's thesis into the realm of education when he writes that cultural pluralism in textbooks usually assumes that each "subculture" has a reasonably fair share of power in the society and ignores the fact that "America's central problem is its treatment of its poor people, who are represented most clearly by the blacks."[99]

The liberal and radical positions on inequality offer practical reform proposals for constructing an American political culture based on respect for the cultural diversity and difference in American life. The positions primarily diverge on questions of whether the individual or the collectivity should be considered to be the primary unit of analysis in constructing an ideal national public culture. Philosophical arguments in multiculturalist literature focused on the primacy of the individual and the collectivity are best represented in what M. M. Slaughter calls the essentialist and constructionist theories of political identity.[100]

b. Essentialist and Constructionist Theories of Political Identity in Multiculturalist Literature

A second and related category of argument in multiculturalist literature concerns the essentialist and constructionist theories of political identity. The essentialist theory, often associated with liberal multiculturalism, views the subject as autonomous by nature and argues

---

[98]Steinberg, Stephen, The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America, (New York: Atheneum, 1981), p. 255.

[99]Morgan, 1981), pp. 20, 103. Morgan contends that cultural pluralism's failure to embrace the political ideas of power, conflict, and power dimensions prevalent in political interest group theory is "a ploy of cultural pluralists" who operate "behind the mask of scientific and academic respectability" and who "represent the interests of the conservative establishment." ibid, p. 41. Other arguments presented in economic multiculturalist literature include the idea that education can lead to the empowerment of economically oppressed groups and create an awareness of options that enable lower-class students to move beyond a "language of critique" to a life full of "possibilities." Giroux, Henry A., "Educational Leadership and the Crisis of Democratic Government,"Educational Researcher, 1991, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 4 - 11. See also Giroux, Henry A., "The Hope of Radical Education," in Weiler, Kathleen and Candace Mitchell, (eds.), What Schools Can Do: Critical Pedagogy and Practice, (Albany, N. Y.: State University Press of New York, 1992).

[100]See Slaughter, 1994.

that identity is based on identification with and participation in the traditions of a constitutive culture or community.[101] The constructionalist theory asserts that the subject is not a natural essence but a subject position whose identity is created through hegemonic forces which construct or "write" social categories onto persons through opposition to the other.[102]

Liberal philosophers have historically pictured the subject as standing apart from, and logically prior to, society and culture;[103] however, the historical notion of the isolated individual standing apart from society and culture, while prominent in core curriculum and monoculturalist arguments,[104] has been modified in contemporary liberal multiculturalist arguments. Charles Taylor, for example, writes:

> [A] crucial feature of human life is its fundamentally *dialogical* character. We become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves, and hence of defining our identity, through our acquisition of rich human languages of expression. . . . People do not acquire the languages needed for self-definition on their own. Rather, we are introduced to them through interaction with others who matter to us. . . . We define our identity always in dialogue with, sometimes in struggle against, the things our significant others want to see in us. Even when we outgrow some of these others -- our parents, for instance -- and they disappear from our lives, the conversation with them continues within us as long as we

---

[101]ibid.

[102]ibid.

[103]Peters, 1996, p. 40.

[104]Core curriculum and monoculturalist arguments typically embrace Allan Bloom's notion of the isolated individual who participates rationally in a common culture based on shared goals or a vision of the public good. The purpose of schooling in this notion is to cultivate reason so that individuals can rise above their own particular circumstances and participate in the common culture. Closely linked to market liberalism's notions of individuals as "rational untility-maximizers," the idea of a self-constituted political identity is frequently expressed in American political discussion today through the argument that American institutions (such as law, education, bureaucracies, and markets) are politically neutral as to outcome and that reforms such as affirmative action, voting rights laws, and gender and race discrimination laws have created a climate in which all Americans can suceed if they only apply themselves and "work hard enough." See Sleeter's discussion of monoculturalist arguments in Sleeter, in Banks and Banks, 1995, pp. 82.

live.[105]

In the above passage, Taylor theorizes political identity as constructed through the subject's identification with and participation in a constitutive community.[106] In this respect, Taylor (and most liberal multiculturalists) embrace the notion of the "other" as significant in the construction of the identity of the self; however, in liberal theory individual identity remains self-created and self-defined. While in Taylor's theory human identity is created dialogically, individuals gain through their communities only the tools needed for defining their identity. Actual definition occurs in and through the individual employing these tools to gain self-understanding and full human development.

The constructionist theory holds a relational understanding of difference that relativizes the previously universal positions of privileged groups in society[107] and tends to view inequality as structured deeply into the language, institutions, and practices of society. It further considers "mainstream" culture to be the ideology of dominant societal groups and the "cultures of the oppressed groups" as sources of strength and insight.[108] By linking oppression with the intersectionality of identity,[109] the politics of difference seeks to develop a comprehensive analysis

---

[105]Taylor, in Gutmann, 1992, pp. 32 - 33. Emphasis in the original.

[106]Based on this theory, Taylor argues that if human identity is dialogically created and constituted, then a society that recognizes individual identity will be a deliberative, democratic society because individual identity is partly constituted by collective dialogues.

[107]See Young, 1995. See also Young, Iris Marion, Justice and the Politics of Difference, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).

[108]Sleeter, in Banks and Banks, 1995. Sleeter uses this definition to describe what she calls "radical leftist" literature in multiculturalist literature.

[109]The politics of difference views identity as constructed at the point of intersection of multiple subject positions. The intersectionality of identity is captured by Kimberle Crenshaw who in articulating an understanding of the intersection of black identity and woman identity writes:

> Intersectionality captures the way in which the particular location of black women in dominant American social relations is unique and in some senses unassimilable into the

of oppression that would help build a "new majority for justice and peace" that can work toward "the collective path of human liberation, self-determination and sovereignty."[110]

Slaughter argues in her analysis of multiculturalism and law that both the constructivist and essentialist notions of political identity contain the potential for group-based reforms.

> Each offers justification for why the political unit should not necessarily be limited to the individual. The social constructivist project is helpful where it questions the entire Enlightenment project of individualism as contingent rather than universal and necessary. . . . The essentialist justification for group rights also questions the focus on the atomic individual, but the argument is that individuals are by their nature communal beings and need community for self-actualization. Despite the substantial philosophical differences between these concepts, each opens up the individual rights-based legal system to the possibility of distributing power to cultural groups.[111]

While Slaughter's argument hints at an understanding of the non-exclusivity of the constructivist and essentialist notions of political identity, she (and most students of multiculturalism) eventually returns to a dichotomous understanding of the individual and the collective in her analysis.[112] In

---

> discursive paradigms of gender and race domination. One commonly noted aspect of this location is that black women are in a sense doubly burdened, subject in some ways to the dominating practices of both a sexual hierarchy and a racial one. In addition to this added dimension, intersectionality also refers to the ways that black women's marginalization within dominant discourses of resistance limits the means available to relate and conceptualize our experiences as black women.

Crenshaw, Kimberle, "Whose Story Is It, Anyway? Feminist and Antiracist Appropriations of Anita Hill," in Toni Morrison, (ed.), Race-ing Justice, En-Gendering Power: Essays on Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas, and the Construction of Social Reality, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992), pp. 402 - 440, cite at p. 404. See also Crenshaw, Kimberle, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color," Stanford Law Review, July 1991, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 1241 - 1299.

[110]Marable, Manning, The Crisis of Color and Democracy, (Monroe, ME.: Common Courage Press, 1992), p. 254, 225, quoted in Sleeter, 1995, p. 91.

[111]Slaughter, 1994, p. 376.

[112]Slaughter writes in her conclusion: "If we raise the question as to how minorities are to attain a political voice -- or give voice to their differences -- we are offered two alternatives."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

an intellectual climate significantly impacted by poststructuralist thought -- a climate that compels interrogation of binary opposites -- understandings of the individual and the collective as dichotomous and mutually exclusive remains largely un-deconstructed in American political discourse. The continued emphasis of multiculturalism on the oppositional "nature" of the individual and the collective in the construction of identity, an emphasis frequently provided in the "name" of poststructuralism, serves to reify the Enlightenment project that most multiculturalists seek to reform.

III. Conclusion

In a dichtomous understanding of individual and collectivity, neither liberal multiculturalism nor radical multiculturalism can be considered a part of multiculturalism. Applying the "separate and dichotomous" understanding of identity to radical multiculturalism, radical multiculturalism's emphasis on the group and insistence on employing principles of opposition in constructing an ideal transcultural language more properly aligns it with cultural separatism than with multiculturalism. The logical conclusion to be derived from the separate and dichotomous understanding of individual and group is that multiculturalism constitutes a discussion of whether the nation should fully assimilate cultural and group difference or dissolve as a nation into separate enclaves (as in the case of the former Soviet Union). Multiculturalist literature contains neither of these arguments and in fact explicitly rejects these views in its opposition to core curriculum, monoculturalist, and cultural separatist theories.

In a frequently cited article entitled "Multiculturalism: E Pluribus Plures," Diane Ravitch broadly outlines two forms of multiculturalism expressed in American politics. The first form, "pluralistic multiculturalism," holds that the United States has a common culture and that this culture was and continues to be formed by the interaction of what Ravitch calls "its subsidiary cultures."[113] According to Ravitch, differences among cultural groups are seen by pluralistic

---

These alternatives are the constructionist view which she states is "not compelling" and the essentialist view which "is more self-empowering." Slaughter, 1994, p. 380.

[113]Ravitch, Diane, "Multiculturalism: E Pluribus Plures," American Scholar, Summer 1990, vol. 59, no. 3, p. 339.

multiculturalism as a national resource rather than a problem to be solved. "Paradoxical though it may seem," Ravitch writes, "the United States has a common culture that is multicultural."[114] The second form of multiculturalism Ravitch identifies is "particularistic multiculturalism." Particularistic multiculturalism denies that a common culture is possible or desirable in the United States, insists that racial and ethnic minorities are not and should not try to be part of American culture, and rejects accommodation among or interaction between cultural groups.[115] A leading cultural separatist, Molefi Kete Asante, sharply criticizes Ravitch's description of particularistic multiculturalism. Asante writes:

> To believe in multicultural education is to assume that there are many cultures. The reason Ravitch finds confusion is because the only way she can reconcile the 'many cultures' is to insist on many 'little' cultures under the hegemony of the 'big' white culture. Thus, what she means by multiculturalism is precisely what I criticized in The Afrocentric Idea, the acceptance of other cultures within a Eurocentric framework.[116]

Asante, along with Harvard sociologist Orlando Patterson,[117] and to some extent political activist Louis Farrakan profess to see no great value in a diversity of groups. More "moderate" cultural separatists such as Kevin Brown oppose the educational ideals of Brown v. Board of Education and advocate the idea of "immersion schools" which aims at resegregating public education along the lines of race.[118] Considering the claims made by both Ravitch in her analysis of particularlistic multiculturalism and Asante in his critique of Ravitch, and in light of the fact

---

[114]ibid.

[115]ibid, p. 341.

[116]Asante, Molefi Kete, untitled essay, in Aufderheide, Patricia, (ed.), Beyond P. C.: Toward a Politics of Understanding, (St. Paul: Graywolf Press, 1992), p. 229.

[117]Patterson, Orlando, Slavery and Social Death, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).

[118]See Brown, Kevin, "Do African-Americans Need Immersion Schools? The Paradoxes Created by the Conceptualization by Law of Race and Public Education," Iowa Law Review, May 1993, vol. 78, no. 4, pp. 813 - 881.

that *multi*culturalism is by its very name concerned with not one but many cultures, the particularistic form of multiculturalism Ravitch describes is more appropriately considered cultural separatism or even a form of monoculturalism than any form of multiculturalism.[119]

In contrast to cultural separatist theories, contemporary scholars such as Henry Louis Gates and Cornel West propose theories of national community based on dialogue and discussion among and between diverse cultural groups in society. The theories Gates and West propose not only illustrate the ways in which a common understanding of national community is advanced through multiculturalist literature but also serve to demonstrate the importance of a national language in achieving a cultural pluralist national ideal. In the following passage, Gates articulates his desire for a common national culture based on national respect and recognition of cultural communities.

> What gets to count as 'our' culture? What makes knowledge worth knowing? Unfortunately, as history has taught us, an Anglo-American regional culture has too often masked itself as universal, passing itself off as our 'common culture,' and depicting different cultural traditions as 'tribal' or 'parochial.' So it's only when we're free to explore the complexities of our hypenated American culture that we can discover what a genuinely common American culture might actually look like. Common sense (Gramscian or otherwise) reminds us that we're *all* ethnics, and the challenge of transcending ethnic chauvinsim is one we all face.[120]

Like Gates, West believes that the discovery of a "genuinely common culture" can occur only

---

[119]Critical race theorist Paul Gilroy writes in criticism of cultural separatism (for adopting the methods of its "racist" opponents):

> [T]he voguish language of absolute cultural difference. . . provides an embarrassing link between the practice of blacks who comprehend racial politics through it and the activities of their foresworn opponents -- the racist New Right -- who approach the complex dynamics of race, nationality, and ethnicity through a similar set of precise, culturalist equations.

Gilroy, Paul, Small Acts, (New York: Serpent's Tail, 1993), p. 127.

[120]Gates, Henry Louis, Jr., Loose Canons: Notes on the Culture Wars, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 175 - 176. Emphasis in the original.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

through an exploration and understanding of cultures within the polity. In his book Race Matters, West centers on the need to raise the internal consciousness of communities in the polity in order for these communities to gain full expression of identity from within. Rich internal expression is to translate into a public conversation of meaning across communities which will come to serve as the common ground of the national political community.[121]

The consensus that binds liberal and radical multiculturalism is most clearly seen through arguments presented against monoculturalist and assimilationist models of national political life. Monoculturalism argues that certain groups and cultures should be assimilated into the American "mainstream" so that individual members of these groups can compete and succeed without the impediment of "dysfunctional" cultural values, languages, and beliefs. Multiculturalism, on the other hand, argues that national policy should be fundamentally committed to respecting group, cultural, and community values and that policy should reflect either the group, cultural, and community attachments of individuals (deriving from the essentialist theory of political identity) or the understandings, experiences, and demands of groups (deriving from the constructionist theory of political identity). In holding that the nation is constituted of distinct and equally valuable groups, cultures, and comunities, multiculturalism stands against the monoculturalist ideals of national life as well as the cultural separatist vision of political life. However, in arguing a cultural pluralist conception of an ideal national public culture, it follows that multiculturalism would be required to provide theories of a language to be employed by cultures and groups for communication among and across cultures and groups. At present, the literature tends to argue the merits of a particular language -- liberal, communitarian, Marxist, feminist, or other -- that would serve as the common base of understanding across cultures. The adoption of a specific language to be used in intercultural communication at the national level would have the effect of producing a national monologue rather than dialogue to the extent that all cultures would be required to adopt the values and conceptions of the good life that such language assumed. In order for multicultural civic education to occur, educators must be conscious of the ways in which the debate about multiculturalism is a meta-discussion of national political identity and how the

---

[121]West, Cornel, Race Matters, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993); West, Cornel, Keeping Faith: Philosophy and Race in America, (New York: Routledge, 1994).

values and conceptions of political identity that emerge from the debate may be used to produce a pegagogy focused on cultural recognition, respect, and communication.